

The Structure of the RAF

What follows are the statements of 2 of 25 RAF prisoners who commented on the structure of the RAF to counter the hysteria and clichés of the psychological warfare, which was developed through the use of the bought-off State Security witness, Gerhard Müller.(1)

"statement of Brigitte Mohnhaupt in Stammheim on the 22-07-76(2)

Brigitte Mohnhaupt (BM) - ...Obviously, it is idiotic to say: student, because that has been the case for all of us and its in the past. One can only respond: nothing of the sort.

The second point is that I won't, in any event, respond to any questions from you, from the court, from the Federal Prosecution. That would be absurd. Our relationship is not such. The exact term for the relationship between us and the court, us and the justice system, us and the Federal Prosecution, is one of war, and the clearest expression of that is that four of us are dead, assassinated as prisoners.

So, there is absolutely no possibility of discussion here, at this level. Why then do we do it, after everything? Why do we come here? Why do we participate in the trial?...

Theodor Prinzing (TP)(3) - No, that's not the objective. The relationship...

BM - Yes, that is part of it. And it's only the beginning. I want to start now with what I intend to say here, and I have no intention of listening to your nonsense.

The reason why, after everything, someone from among us would still come here, after the death of Ulrike(4), is because we believe it is necessary, via what we can say here, to clearly expose the true structure of the group as it really is and was.

It is not as in the distillation of psychological warfare, which Müller presented in his statements, it is not that which he claimed - that is to say, practically a fascist structure. It is necessary that this is finally clear. And this will obviously smash the entire construction, whereby Ulrike could have committed suicide.

It's not our problem to prove how or if Müller lied. This level: criminology - it certainly doesn't concern us. For us, it is only a question of contents, to clarify the contents of the politics, the contents of the structure as it really was. Certainly, that is very difficult here, but we will try to describe it simply.

I will now do that. I would like to start with the core of Müller's statement, with its goal. As such, the statement

regarding the attacks and his implication, the implication which State Security determines is necessary so as to arrive at convictions. It is necessary here to specify that the strategic conception that the RAF developed in 72 was directed against the military presence and the policy of the USA in the Federal Republic(5), and the different tactical and operational stages to respond to this were the attack against the Headquarters of the CIA in Frankfurt, the attack against the Headquarters of the American Army in Heidelberg, and the kidnapping of the three City Commanders in Berlin. That this decision, this project, was developed in the course of collective discussions with all of those who participated in the organization of the RAF is to say that there was a consensus of all the groups, of each of the units in the cities, and, as such, a clear consciousness on everyone's part as to what this signified - of the function of these attacks.(6)

As such, we are all responsible for these attacks against the US military presence in the Federal Republic. That is to say, we are all responsible for the actions, for the attacks against the Headquarters.

That already says everything about the structure. And it makes it clear that what Müller, that idiot, is trying to say: that six people could have carried out, after all - could have carried out all of the attacks which occurred. It's completely absurd.

Within the totality of the strategic conception, there was also the project of taking the Allied Commanders prisoner and exchanging them. The escalation that that would have represented and the escalation that was contained in this project from the perspective of the reaction, I do not, in any event, want to talk about here. There is really nothing to say about it here.

The decision, the conception of these attacks and our responsibility, is explained by an essential element of our history: the polarization in the mobilization of the student movement to oppose the Vietnamese War. There was, for us, one completely clear way to understand the limitations of the mobilization for Vietnam, its objective limitations: what it could attain and what it could not attain, before being crushed and recuperated.

One could say that the experience of the necessity of armed struggle - that is to say, to attain the level which corresponds to the situation which we find ourselves in here in the FRG, an American colony, a strategic sub-center of American imperialism - is the situation which constituted the RAF. All of the argumentation has already been developed here in the statements. I don't believe it is necessary to repeat it again. For me, it is necessary to explain this on the basis of the group.

Concretely, regarding the City Commanders. The kidnapping had from a material perspective, the goal of freeing the prisoners, that is to say, to achieve via the kidnapping, an exchange of

prisoners, who during that period, had already been arrested, and against whom, in that period, isolation and torture had been used.

That signifies that for the group, it was objectively necessary to free the prisoners. The exchange was only way.

Müller, as far as I know, didn't talk about the Berlin City Commanders, except in his gossip to Stern(7); in his statement, he left this totally aside. The desired goal was, quite simply, to completely suppress the politics of the RAF in 1972. It's clear that Berlin was a decisive event for us, and relatively difficult to realize, difficult operationally. Three City Commanders, three, that signified: three large commandos to realize it. The action was already in the execution phase, but as a result of the arrests it could not be carried out: Andreas(8) was arrested about two weeks before the chosen date, and as a result, obviously, a part of the infrastructure was smashed. That is, we couldn't know if the part of the infrastructure foreseen for the imminent action was equally effected. To this was added the fact that the American City Commander was heavily guarded. The conjuncture and coordination was difficult. For us, it was no longer possible to realize this action.

But this is important, because that is what we were ready for - in particular Andreas and Gudrun(9). It is exactly for this reason that the State Security won't let Müller talk anymore, to be able to claim that Andreas and Gudrun participated in the attacks against the Police Headquarters(10).

It's disgusting and it's idiotic. This doesn't correspond at all to the facts. Andreas and Gudrun were, during this period, with me in Berlin, and we didn't organize the thing down there.

His construction is demented, as if four or five people could themselves alone carry out all of these attacks against the FRG. It is not even necessary to dwell on this, because each person can arrive at their own conclusions to which point this is ridiculous, and the goal is evident. So, this entire monstrosity - these five accused, to whom everything is directly attributed, and of whom only three remain(11). All of that is the same line, by which the same dramaturgy, in effect, the entire line being applied, becomes clear: it's psychological warfare carried out by the Federal Prosecutor and the court - there is no contradiction within it, and, naturally, it cannot have any.

Müller says about Munich(12) - I believe he said it was Andreas and Holger who did it. The fact is that neither one nor the other participated. I have already said: at this point Andreas was in Berlin, and these actions were carried out by groups who were in Munich. Finally - now we can say it - the RAF was at the time organized in the following way: there were eight groups established in six cities, as such, two strong

groups in two cities. One of these groups was in Munich. The groups, the different units, were integrated in a logistical system. There was a link between the different groups for discussions, but they were autonomous in their decisions regarding operational execution.

The precise objective, the planning, the verification, the moment of action, was left as the choice of the different groups - and it could not have been otherwise. And it naturally worked like this; we didn't know anything concrete in advance about these actions - however, even if we had known, we wouldn't have prevented them, because - ya, it's not a simple thing to prevent what a group has decided. Only - we couldn't have prevented it, neither from the perspective nor technically, it was impossible given the conditions. It was clear, the sense of these actions was clear: they were a response to the fact that combatants were shot in the street. That is, Petra and Tommy(13). It could never have been our intention to prevent them.

The goal sought by Müller, with such implications, is very exactly to cover the strategic conception, to completely exclude it, to destroy it by idiotic implications. The strategic conception, which was defined from the beginning against American military presence, against the occupation by the US Army, against total political and economic dependence vi-a-vis the USA. That is the goal to be achieved by a statement with these implications. It is important because it attempts to repudiate the politics of the group, attempts to destroy them.

There is still more. When he claims - I could perhaps concretize this again later in the light of the particular questions that you will pose to me, for now I will only do so in a general way. As such, the assertion which suggests that Ulrike carried out the attack against the Springer Building(14) in opposition to Andreas or Gudrun or a part of the group. And the assertion that there was in its wake a split, or, at least, in the same sense, struggles between members, terror, or I don't know what it was that the pig said exactly. The truth is that when the Hamburg action was carried out - and this was already clarified in this trial - we knew nothing, precisely because of our structure: it was an autonomous action carried out in an autonomous way by the Hamburg groups.

After the action, there was a strong criticism on the part of other groups. As a result, Ulrike went to Hamburg to find out on the spot what was going on and to transmit information accordingly as to how this was possible, because the RAF, in its basic understanding, never conceived of actions where there was a risk that civilians could be effected. It was an essential principle in all discussions and the criticism addressed to the Hamburg group was that they carried out the action without clearly seeing, without envisioning in their conception, that Springer, naturally, wouldn't evacuate the building. As such, it was ill-prepared. It was in that sense that Ulrike was sent at this time to

Hamburg, to clarify this, to find out what had happened. After her consultations, she formulated the statement about this action, in which everything was said - the entire process, the warnings, Springer not evacuating, etc.. Which, as such, indicates that what Müller said, ya, we know that already, and we know the goal. What he claims now, regarding Ulrike, that she, in general, had, or could have had, the intention of carrying out actions against the will of the others - it's completely absurd - which corresponds perfectly to the line followed by the propaganda: tensions, etc.. This function is meant to legitimate Ulrike's murder. The claim that there were tensions is a story that goes back - according to what Müller has said here - to Hamburg, to the organization of the group in 71-72. It is purely and simply an invention that they are attempting to construct here, with one goal, to legitimate the murder...(15)

TB - Good, now I must tell you that your opinions and value judgments are not relevant here. All of your allegations that there has been a murder here, I cannot, in any event, accept. You will force me to apply the regulations.

BM - Of course. There is still a point with regards to Berlin. When Müller claims that Andreas ordered the actions there, or even that he pushed people, I don't know his exact formulation. It's absurd, because the action against the City Commanders was impossible before the others were carried out. There was, as such, no discussion regarding the actions in Berlin. If Müller says this, it only signifies one thing - because he already exposed the action against the City Commanders in "Stern", and clearly he knew about them, but certainly not the concrete details - in maintaining this assertion, the political line was to be destroyed. Above all, no political line should be found in these constructions, and naturally not in this trial.

That is all I want to say about this series of actions for the moment.

Defense Attorney Temming (DAT) - And precisely regarding the fact that Müller, the crown witness Müller, stated that the attack against Springer was conceived and prepared by Ulrike Meinhof...

(The Prosecution contests the question because of the use of the term "crown witness".)

DAT - I will pose my question differently: do you know if Ulrike was in Hamburg at this time, and do you know if there were tensions between Ulrike and Andreas regarding this point or others or in a general way, how were their relations?

BM - I've already commented on this subject, that there was a general criticism after this action, that is to say, between all...

TP - We don't want to hear any more repetition here.

BM - But, really, stop it, you don't even know what I'm going to say.

It's precision that he wants. So, perhaps I will repeat the core of the issue. What happened is what I have already said: Ulrike left, at that time, to elucidate the facts and then, on the basis of the results, on the basis of a verification of the facts in Hamburg, to formulate a statement.

More explicitly, it occurred as such, she was in Berlin and, in mid-May, roughly, she went to Stuttgart. She was in Berlin to prepare the kidnapping. She participated in the planning and organization.

Afterwards, she went to Stuttgart to do another important job. And if she did it, it was because she understood a lot about it, simply stated, she could do it well. It is necessary to obtain material for discussion and that is the context in which Ulrike worked: the organization of information on the international plane. That is to say that she attempted to make known the process of discussion which existed on the Left, precisely on the international plane, with foreign groups. At that time the discussion about the guerilla in the factories was current. There were attempts of that type in Italy, a certain tactic which was possible in Italy, as a result of specific conditions - but which we thought was not possible here. And that was precisely what she wanted to do at that time: to organize the entire process of discussion from this angle, within the perspective of an international strategy. That was the goal of the trip to Stuttgart. I think that Andreas called her in Stuttgart right after the event in Hamburg, because criticism was so clearly unleashed against us, and she left immediately for Hamburg to clarify this. It was in this way that it happened, I believe. In this way, I have, at the same time, responded to the question as to whether there were differences, or whatever the hell, a split. These facts show very clearly and very distinctly that all of that is a fabrication.

DAT - Another question. It concerns the statements of the Prosecution witness, Gerhard Müller, who claims that the liquidation of Siegfried Hausner(16) was anticipated. Do you know anything regarding this subject, and do you know if individuals left the group, or how it occurred?

BM - Of course there were partings. It would be false to say otherwise. There are contradictions which develop within the group in the course of the process which this one is engaged in. As such, in the process of the struggle, there are obviously contradictions, and there are people who decide at a certain point to no longer do the work. In not wanting any more, they decide to return, to go back, or they try another practice, even if everyone knows very well that this isn't possible, that it is a lie, when one has already had such a practice. Such a decision can only be

a step backwards, which always signifies a step backwards into shit.

There were partings, but there was never a question of liquidation in any parting. There were partings with people who could no longer do the work, who no longer wanted to do it, because they understood that it meant illegality, which armed struggle always means. That was a completely free decision on their part. It was correct that they leave - it would be stupid to keep them, because it wouldn't, in any event, any longer be possible to have a common practice.

There were also partings which we ourselves decided upon. There were people who knew that we were separating from them for clear reasons - in the final analysis, naturally, for the same reasons, because, at a given moment, it was no longer possible to have a common practice. They do other things, conscious that they can never again have this practice.

Maybe it should be explained how it occurred when people decided to stop. It always happened in the following way. It was always decided in the course of a discussion involving the entire group, the unit in which the person participated, that is to say that everyone participated, or at least the majority, all for whom it was possible, under these conditions, to participate.

This took place in the context of discussions. It wasn't done in a brusque way. Each time there was an evolution which allowed the one concerned, exactly at the same level as all of the others, as each person within the group, to understand that the point had been reached where it was no longer possible to struggle together, that at that point he must make a decision: to change from that point - if he still wants to, if he has the courage, if he can do it - and, clearly, with the help of all of the others, of course. Or he can leave. And then he can leave unhindered, without pressure, because it's his decision, because he understands it as such, and because that involves a process which implicates everyone. Because every parting or exclusion, if it isn't understood in a responsible manner, signifies hate, and, as such, sooner or later, the guy will end up at the cops. The group never threw anyone out. It never happened that way. That isn't the structure of the group.

This is also an element that renders Müller's entire Hausner story entirely impossible: the liquidation story. That is to say, naturally it is, in principle, possible. That is no problem. This is simply a fact when one struggles in illegality. But in the entire process which the group realized in 72, this would have been an error, would have been in contradiction with the situation. As regards Hausner, it is even more absurd, because it is completely false that he wanted to leave. There was absolutely no reason, given who he was, given what he had done, that would have led us to oblige him to leave or, purely and simply, to have liquidated him. It's absolutely ridiculous.

Nothing justifies it. Obviously, everyone makes mistakes or things of that sort, but nobody had the arrogance or the absolutism to say: me, I don't make mistakes.

In any case, that was the situation in the group. How could we have said: now it is necessary that he leave, and if he doesn't leave the country, then... - because what Müller said, that if he couldn't go to Holland, couldn't be evacuated to a foreign country, then it was necessary - an emergency solution - quite simply, to liquidate him: only the State Security could invent such things. Such a thing could never fortify the structure, the group, the individuals, but on the contrary would weaken it, would destroy it.

Because if such a thing could happen in the group, how would it ever again be possible that people could struggle, that the courage could exist, that they could find an identity.

To liquidate someone who has struggled with us, as a 1st resort, simply because there is perhaps no longer a place for him - that is a completely ridiculous construction.

I can give another example: the story of the woman in Berlin, Edelgart Gräfer, I believe - in any case, Gräfer - who denounced a half a dozen people. She betrayed the people. She gave their address. And what happened? What did we do? She got a slap in the mouth and was hit in the throat with a placard. So, I think when the facts are known - when someone denounces people, in effect lines them up against the wall, because we never know what could happen when the cops break into an apartment - and this person receives a slap in the head, then it is all the more absurd to think that someone who has never betrayed anyone could - as the result of a situation where everything culminates as Müller describes it: searches and whatever, arrests - could simply be shot down. It's absolutely out of the question.

And, finally, the proof, I might say, which shows that all of that is impossible. It is that Siegfried Hausner led the Commando Holger Meins(17). And it is out of the question that it could have been otherwise, could have been done differently. Quite simply, he made the arrangements, he did it himself, which clarifies what the structure was. I believe that we can clearly understand. How could he have done it, how could he have struggled after a story like Müller told.

DAT - Another thing: the Prosecution witness, Müller, claimed that it was Andreas Baader who wanted the hierarchical structure, that Andreas Baader had wanted control. I would like to know if this was possible, if this was possible given the structure of the group? And what was the general relationship of the group to the question of leadership?

BM - Was there ever anyone who wanted to take leadership...

Federal Prosecutor Zeis (FPZ) - It seems to me that this problem, whether or not there was a hierarchical structure or not, was already the object of a long statement this morning...

BM - I want to introduce some concrete things...

FPZ - The question...

BM - I want to introduce some concrete things about Andreas.

FPZ - Enough, be quiet when I speak.

BM - Oh, really, stop talking drivel!

You talked about the "claim to lead" the group. No. If someone had claimed to lead, then he would only have made himself ridiculous. So, the claim to want to lead is, quite simply, ridiculous. So, reality, as it was and as we understood it: leadership could be a function and, in certain situations, could be necessary, for example, during actions. That is how we defined it, and, naturally, it was Andreas who assumed this function. If he assumed it, it was simply because he could, in a very precise way, develop a conception of situations, and based on this analysis of situations, he could conceive a tactic. He could arrange a certain development, as such, fix a line, that is to say, the tactical and strategic line. But this was never simply the development or the solitary decision of a single person. The conception, the project developed by a member, is next submitted to discussion by everyone, because everyone participates concretely in the practice and, as such, also in the line. Everyone must discuss the line, understand it, contribute to its development - and everyone must be able to make decisions in each situation. Because in certain situations, we are alone, and if we don't understand then nothing will work. What Andreas did was determined, precisely established and developed by everyone in the course of discussions. And from the moment the line was established, Andreas, like everyone else, naturally, had to rigorously follow the line, that is to say, was tied to the line. Of course, this wasn't a constraint, quite simply, because everyone understood that it was necessary, that it was just, a just tactic, for him, as for the others. Later, this was completely blown out of proportion. That is to say that leadership always has a certain function, and, naturally, for those who use it, as for those who assume it, it is only supportable if it isn't domination, if it is entirely defined by what everyone wants. In any event, the principle in the organization is free will. That is to say that everyone must be able and must want to do it. We called this the cadre line - that everyone can arrive, whether they have been in the RAF for a long time or not, at an equal place, thus, that everyone can do everything themselves. That is not this stupid thing about which Müller speaks here, with his open group - in practice this means that everyone participates in the entire work process. This doesn't exist - this indicates that his statement is totally false; be-

cause this would signify that everyone knew everything, and, as such, concretely, that Müller knows everything. But Müller knows very little, because Müller wasn't cadre. It is simply an invention on his part, with the specific goal pursued by the State Security.

TP - So, another value judgement...

BM - No, I'm not finished yet. One moment...

TP - Keep to the facts which you know and which you can clarify, please.

BM - This is precisely one. I know that he wasn't cadre.

TP - That you can talk about, but the rest is a personal opinion. Has this responded to the question in a satisfactory way, Mr. Defense Attorney?

BM - No, I'm not finished yet...

TP - Tell me, have you got a project prepared for each question posed to you here?

BM - Obviously, I've... I've reflected about what I hear here, of course.

TP - Do you know the questions that are going to be posed to you?

BM - How do you expect me to know them?

TP - If you have a conception...

BM - I've read about the Müller affair in the press...

TP - You've already seen the dossiers concerning Müller?

BM - I've read the Müller statements in the press. Listen to what I say. And on the basis of what I know about Müller, on the basis of what I know about him from "Info"(18), etc., from the "Stern" article - that has given me some examples. I've clarified some points myself. The points where he describes the structure of the group. I will say it: it's fascist, it's a fascist band structure which he presents - so it's clear to me what I can say here in my function as a witness.

So, the cadre line. That is to say that everyone must have the capacity to see themselves. Naturally, that is concretely related to leadership: that is to say that everyone must be able to assume leadership, which, simply, signifies that there can never be domination, that leadership is defined as a function, but it can disappear. That, quite simply, is a condition for continuity, so that if a cadre is arrested, we are not immobilized and disor-

iented, but people can themselves make decisions, can continue, that there isn't a rupture, there isn't a collapse. That is the condition for continuity, and as such, the condition for the entire politic, for the entire practice. We said once in this regard, that the guerilla is a hydra, that is to say that it always develops new heads. The objective is to arrive at that. In the discussion in "Info" - "Info", which the Federal Prosecution certainly has, very certainly, so, they know full well, in this regard, that there was never a hierarchy - there is a phrase which expresses what I think very precisely, a phrase from Holger(19) that says: "Everyone is the collective". That is exactly what I think. And a phrase from Ulrike, stated during her Berlin trial: "The guerilla is the group". That is to say that everyone gains or gives something in the entire learning process, which, obviously, is permanent, is practice. And it is only, in any event, in this way that we learn, by this practice, that is to say, in this confrontation, because it obliges, it forces, learning. It forces transformation. It is in this way that "the guerilla is the group".

Messengers and bosses, superiors and underlings - as Müller asserted - that's antagonistic with such a structure, with armed politics, with the guerilla. It is the model of the apparatus that spews out schematas in the context of psychological warfare: the State Security.

We have defined what leadership is for us: "Leadership - what it must be: it is a concrete perception of the situation and how to transcend it: the objectives and their transmission within the structure of the fighting group". That is to say, what we have learned is that the leadership in the guerilla is permanent initiative, the imposition of the politics, of armed proletarian politics.

It is not "leadership" which constitutes the guerilla group, but it appears only as a function that we have need of in the learning and working processes of the group, of the illegal group - so it is born of and for the group's practice. When everything goes well, it assembles the initiatives and the experiences of everyone - this develops a collective process which engenders the continuity and the capacity to act. It can only work like that. To return to the phrase - the basis of all of this is the relationship between subjectivity and objectivity, that is between will and necessity, to bring them together and carry them into action. It is only in this way - a simple question of experience - that subjectivity is, in any event, possible. Who you are, you - the person who struggles - the subject, that you become who you are and who you want to be, that is really the point of struggle. That is what we are trying to summarize here: liberty is only possible in a struggle for liberation.

DAT - How can this be reconciled with the power to give orders, which supposedly existed and which was supposedly exercised by

Andreas Baader, according to the statement of the Prosecution witness? He gave the example, I believe, of an order to shoot - that all members of the RAF, in the case of an arrest, had to defend themselves with arms.

BM - Ya, I'll split my answer into two parts.

On the one hand, the relationship, the understanding that the group had regarding orders, how the group defined this - and how they defined the entire process - and defining this was a process for us. And, after that, very concretely, regarding the order to shoot.

I'll speak, as such, in a general way, about orders: we saw the order as a collective decision in the execution phase. So, during the action, there were orders - it's simple, it's a military necessity, and it is also correct, it's functional. And it's exactly because it's functional that it has nothing to do with constraint, because the action is a collective decision. It was discussed in advance. It was determined by everyone, and everyone had a precise job to do, which everyone did. And orders are only a question of coordination.

That is one thing. The other is the power to give orders. The entire image outlined by Müller, the one regarding Andreas, the boss with absolute power...

So, for example, the order to shoot, according to Müller's statements. I will simply say that this is a distillation of psychological warfare since 1970, which claims that the RAF members have an order to shoot. About which the RAF has often spoken, about exactly this and precisely on this point. But I will speak about it even more precisely. It has been spread in the media since Hamburg, since Petra was shot; the order to shoot, as such, cannon fodder, human material sent to the front by some people in the shadows - that is exactly the construction. And Müller...

TP - You must now respond to the question about the order to shoot, posed by...

BM - I'm now talking...

TP - ...the defense attorney. What you are developing here has nothing to do with the question.

BM - Ya, I have another opinion.

I'm in the process of talking about the order to shoot.

In reality, Müller knows very well that there was never an order to shoot. There was none and no one among us received it. Why does he claim so - I just said, according to the expression used here, that that has "nothing to do with the subject",

that it is a distillation of psychological warfare that is to be justified in this statement, to make it appear that this is true, with the goal of destroying the group.

Defense Attorney Heldmann (DAH) - Müller claimed here, in his role as a witness, that the structure of the Red Army Faction was as follows: Baader - the main leader, then a core membership, then simple members, and, at last, marginal members. Can you confirm these statements?

BM - I've said, in this regard, how we understood it and how it was: many heads and the cadre line, how we developed it, how it was developed in the entire process. That was the goal, and it was already that way in most groups that had been together for some time.

Concerning members on the margins, etc., what can be said is that there were, of course, contacts with people who weren't completely integrated into the group. But this is completely correct, because the RAF is, it must not be forgotten, a military organization and not a neighborhood collective. That is to say that contacts are decided according to precise functions, according to political and operational criteria. That, for example, was naturally part of it. You see very well, again very clearly, the nonsense of this claim about an "open group".

That things could be organized so that everybody had access to all information or took part in all operations - that is obviously not possible, not everyone needs to know everything - understandably not. Everyone has the information that is necessary for him to do what he has to do. That is to say that it is the function which determines this. To do anything else would be idiotic, absolutely out of the question, and everyone understood very well why it wasn't necessary. - There is a very open discussion developed within the groups and between the groups about strategy and tactics, as well as theory and analysis, but which remains very clear on principles of organization. It is an open, collective process of all those who struggle. - It is correct that I only know what concerns me, because one must, naturally, deal with the fact that when one is arrested, there can be traitors, one could break under pressure, one could be tortured. We know this and it is, quite simply, the condition of all illegal military organization, to act as necessary, as a function of the conditions. If not it is a collective of idiots.

For a group that wants to struggle, all this rubbish about an "open group" would never arrive at anything, because it would signify acting like a bunch of ignoramuses, like people who don't know at all what they're doing.

Openness is a very good thing, open discussions, open, frank relationships - and that is also how it happens, but never concerning military details: that is to say that the political structure

is open and collective and within the commandos there is also a collective work style, but the question of military details, of contacts, etc., is strictly functional, conspiratorial...

TP - It is not a question of asking what the term "open" means. I believe, Mr. Heldmann, regarding the question which you've posed three times, it has been sufficiently answered...

BM - ...open group - as a principle of organization for an illegal group - simply, does nothing but support a stupid denunciation.

DAH - Are there members who exercise a control over other members? That is to say, does there exist a control function within the group, or even the control of a group?

BM - How a "control function"? I don't really understand.

DAH - I can't say exactly either. I have page 10,221 from the minutes of the main trial here - an extract from Müller's statement: "What's more, these core members, these members of the leadership, exercised a permanent control". And another example: "Take, for example, one of these people in Stuttgart - one of these core members, as Mr. Müller calls them - he constantly telephoned Berlin to keep the situation there under control and to see if people were behaving as they should".

BM - Oh, telephone - this example speaks for itself. Information is, simply, a necessary condition to be able to act, to be able to determine the overall situation, and that, obviously, also goes on between us, between the different groups. That's entirely clear, because to be able to intervene on certain points, it is necessary to know what's going on in other cities. And if those who were in Stuttgart called Berlin, it was completely normal. Everybody did it many times every day when we were going to do something together or when we had to coordinate certain things. To speak of control in this matter again proves that the statement is total twaddle.

DAH - Are there or have there ever been lawyers who were members of the RAF?

BM - Lawyers who were members of the RAF - that's more or less the same thing. We can only laugh, because our relationships with lawyers are distant. Lawyers are lawyers, and as lawyers, they aren't members of the RAF. And we certainly don't want to have lawyers in the RAF, and we never had any. It's a contradiction in itself. If someone is a lawyer, he wouldn't want to be a member of the RAF, except if he was no longer a lawyer - because he would have to make a complete break with his job. Lawyers are part of the justice system, even if they criticize it. That must be clear. And our relationship with lawyers has been and is - and it's odd - shitty. I really don't feel like talking about it more precisely, because it's very tiresome, always the same thing

- because those guys usually have their own interests, obscure personal interests, and a fear which they rationalize politically. Most of them try to pull the wool over the prisoners' eyes. So there's always problems.

DAT - A question regarding "Info". The Prosecution witness, Müller, claims that "Info" served to achieve criminal ends, internally and externally, but mostly outside the prisons. Could you speak a little bit about the function of "Info"? Secondly: could you specify if there's an obligation to participate in "Info"? And thirdly: in connection with "Info", was any pressure exercised by some prisoners over other prisoners via "Info"?

BM - "Info" was completely contrary to that. It is the only possibility - that is how we conceived of and understood it - the only possibility, in general, of social interaction between isolated prisoners. Even if it was only a surrogate, only letters and paper. But it was the only possibility for political discussion, political information, and, obviously, orientation. There was absolutely no hierarchical structure or anything of that sort. Regarding what Müller said about "Info" 1 - I don't remember the exact terms he used anymore - that there were diverse categories, that one had to pass from one category to another, as such, a sort of careerist system of ascension - it's absurd.

"Info" 1 was everyone organized in the RAF, and was simply functional.

"Info" 2, practically speaking, didn't exist. It should be produced one day, but, in reality, it never existed. And "Info" 2, which was never produced, was the one that functioned as the "Info" for the hungerstrike and all of the prisoners who participated in the hungerstrike. I see absolutely no hierarchy in that, no category. I simply came from two different groups. The first was made up of members of the RAF. The second was made up, in large part, by other prisoners, like those from the Movement 2nd of June(20) and guerilla groups from Hamburg and Munich. So, all of those who participated in the hungerstrike, and that was a certain number. It was impossible to simply short-circuit it. It was two different levels of discussion, of relationships within the groups. The short-circuit was in the attempt to give a united article, but had, in general, no real function.

And "Info" 3 had nothing to do with hierarchy. "Info" 3 difused information, that is to say, newspaper articles, analyses, articles on political economy, etc.; so, elementary information material. Everyone who was in prison and wanted it for their work received it. To say that "Info" 3 was, in a certain way, at an inferior level is complete nonsense. It represented a certain form of political information - the press, press reports, foreign reports, as such, everything we needed to have an overview; and also eventually economic analyses which we made. That was the content of "Info" 3.

Regarding those that...how did you say it?

DAT - Was there an obligation to participate...

BM - Oh, I see. The sense of "Info" - its entire function as we determined it, was as a means against isolation. We have said: every phrase which a prisoner writes in "Info" is like an act, each phrase is an action. And it was as such for the prisoners. We had nothing, no possibility to do anything in isolation, except to use this means of communication. And that was really - if one can say so - a radical process of collectivization for those who had not previously known one. Because, through "Info", everyone knew what everyone else was writing. In general, it was completely different from hierarchy or a structure of that type. Everyone wrote what he thought, what was, for him, the problem, the point where he couldn't progress alone, always attempting to give a political appreciation, attempting to understand the situation and the conditions, so as to be able to resist isolation, against the annihilation of the group by isolation. And, in this measure, it naturally played a role where everyone exercised a control on everyone else. But that is a good thing. It is not at all bad. It is not domination, but the negation of domination. I would even say: it was an attempt to maintain a structure in prison, that is, on a completely different level, that is, as the precise negation of the Fascist structure - and, as such, against the entire machine that wants to render each of us impossible. As such, "Info" was simply a way for us to continue to struggle, even at this level and in the only way possible for a prisoner kept in isolation, except by the effort of analysis, by determination. It is obviously a very limited possibility, and the example of its limitation is the hungerstrike - it is, quite simply, our ultimate means of defense: otherwise, we would not be obligated to hungerstrike against isolation...

DAT - I have another question to pose regarding the function, or the so-called function, of discipline.

(Prinzing disallowed the question.)

DAT - We could, perhaps, better explain this in the context of the hungerstrike: what function did the hungerstrike have? During the hungerstrike was there an effort to exercise, over the prisoners on hungerstrike, a pressure of some sort via "Info"? So, first: what was the function of the hungerstrike? and second: was "Info" used during the hungerstrike as a medium of discipline, to prevent anyone from breaking the hungerstrike?

BM - "Info" was never a medium of discipline, neither during the hungerstrike nor at any other time - coming from who, from who really, each of us or what? "Info" wasn't a whip to keep people in line, but a weapon that each of us needed, because it was a means of communication, even if it was only paper. Perhaps it is ridiculous to speak of a weapon, but the situation is such. There is really no other means in isolation.

And concretely, during the hungerstrike, there was, obviously, no pressure. The hungerstrike is a practical example of the fact that no pressure can, in any event, be exercised, because, otherwise, the actions would be impossible. We discussed the hungerstrike for a long time between ourselves. Should we do it or not? What did the group think about the conditions? That is to say, each member of the group. The Federal Prosecution seized all of the material, so, obviously, they know all of this full well. All of their claims are only means of defamation, but of no importance. In any case, the hungerstrike was the product, the result of the discussion. And in the discussion, each person clarified the questions: can I and do I want to hungerstrike? Because we know full well what it signified: that the situation could take us to our death. That is to say that this was and always is a condition of struggle: one can die, one can be defeated. Our experience is that it can't be any other way in prison. In any case, that was an individual decision for everyone, and it could only work under those conditions. In "Info" itself, we can directly verify this, in what everyone wrote; whether he wanted to do it and why, if he felt he could do it, and, obviously, whether he found it correct, the tactic, etc.. In a general way, whether the hungerstrike could be a means, could be a weapon for the prisoners. We drew the conclusion that it was one for us, a modest one, because we had no others. And regarding the thirst strike, where it goes much faster, it was entirely clear. For example, Ulrike's statement in Berlin, that we would thirststrike if Andreas was again denied water (as had happened at Schwalmstadt). That is to say, obviously he would die. All of these decisions were taken collectively. It was also very simple. We can even prove it, but that is certainly not what we want to do: it doesn't interest us to enter into legal argumentation to destroy the lies and the falsifications of the press and the State Security. We can show that we were in accord, and that those who collapsed under the conditions of the hungerstrike, as a result of the total confrontation it represented, are, obviously, also evidence that this was not done under duress. They stopped and that signified, for them, that they didn't want any more of these politics, that is to say, of the form of struggle that these politics - the guerilla - necessarily imply, without which it is not imaginable - those are the conditions - that they don't want any more of this confrontation, that they want to live at any price. Even if that only means to continue to vegetate, like an animal, like a plant, in solation. Not to struggle - rebellion, revolutionary war, that's no longer their thing.

Müller himself stopped. He stopped and he betrayed us. The way in which collapse occurred in his case, he shows very clearly: he only gazes at his navel and doesn't develop another politic, that is what he sold himself for. He wanted a deal, and that he now has. In this, he is completely consumed by the State Security. The result of a history of three years of brainwashing, and there are letters from him where he says as much. Now it's a completely different story.

DAT - One more question to finish. You have said that the hunger-strike was a way of struggle, even if a limited one: "Info" was as such also a weapon. Fighting against what and a weapon against what?

BM - The hungerstrike? Against the conditions of detention, against extermination by isolation. Because it was absolutely necessary to do something against that, to fight against that, and because this struggle was only possible on the basis of all of these conditions. Experience showed us that everything attempted on the legal level, for example the complaints - and everything I know about from all of these years - remained absolutely ineffective. Because it is like this, as I said in the beginning: the relationship is war.

The entire machine created by the State Security, the Secret Services, the media, and the political justice system carries out a war, is a function of counter-insurgency. And the legal means that remain are obviously completely impotent, mere decorations. This quickly became clear. - That was clear for us with Astrid(21), the first one who was really destroyed by the dead-wing. We didn't have, the prisoners didn't have, any other means except the hungerstrike, an action carried out from a position which was really an extremely defensive position, but carried out collectively, with determination - on the basis of the decision that we would break the means employed against the prisoners: isolation. It was obviously also a weapon, or, in any case, it could become one.

(Prinzing interrupts.)

FPZ - You earlier asserted, in response to a question from the honorable attorney, Dr. Heldmann, I believe, that there was no order to shoot within the group. So, I would like to ask you why then, at the time of your arrest, you were carrying a weapon in perfect working order, as such, ready to shoot? Would you respond to this question?

BM - Oh, nonsense, no.

TP - What legal basis do you evoke?

BM - Absolutely no legal basis. After everything I've just said, it's really too stupid.

"statement from Helmut Pohl in Stammheim"(22)

Helmut Pohl - To start with those two there in green should go away. I already noticed this morning that those two can read my notes. As well, I can't talk if I'm wedged into my chair.(23)

(After the guards are placed between him and Prinzing.)

Of course, make a wall. I deduce I'm not going to get the opportunity that Klaus Junscheke had yesterday.(24)

I will start with what I've directly participated since I've been in the group - that was around the beginning of 1971. I want to talk about this period, because it is essential to understanding the structure of the RAF: the entire dimension which one uses towards the exterior in the struggle against the apparatus, against the imperialist State, could not have been developed if this politic - the struggle for liberation - isn't achieved from the beginning of the organization itself, that is to say, internally. It is on this condition that guerilla can be effective - it will not be necessary to return to this point. That is how it grows, that everyone approaches it as such, that everyone is put in contact with their practice in a way that they can see it and begin to struggle. The goal is that everyone struggle, and that can't be achieved by directives and orders or whatever other bullshit Müller exposed.

What was, on the contrary, clear was the impulse, the resolve, quite simply, the search for something new - precisely in opposition to the shit here. That was what made it attractive and created the base of support. This existed from the beginning and absolutely couldn't have been otherwise.

That is why the entire attempt here to falsely attribute, on the basis of the statements fabricated by Müller, a hierarchical structure to the RAF, a police structure, is, quite simply, absurd. But that is without importance: what is going on is that this construction is the central element of the psychological war that has been carried on against us for six years. As a counter-measure, as a means of warfare, with the goal of placing an image of structures in the heads of people - structures that they know, that they daily live and hate. And Müller is, in reality, only an instrument of this counter-strategy carried out against us; a figure bought and force fed by the State Security, with the goal of giving his banal projections a vague air of authenticity.

That it is war, and the reasons it is carried out as such, speaks for the loss of legitimacy of this State and for the fact that it is, as such, obliged to obtain loyalty by force... .

(Prinzing interrupts.)

...because it cannot continue to obtain this loyalty except by re-

pression...for example, the 71-72 search for us clearly showed this: the centrally organized campaign of defamation against us in the media, with the demagogic appeals of the politicians, and, finally, the open use of police terror after the poll in the summer of 71 indicated that there was massive support in the country for the RAF's struggle; that this was understood in spite of the various attempts at anti-communist brain-washing, because the people have discovered and recognized what they want.

It is precisely against this that the psychological war is directed, with its campaigns of disorientation and its psychological actions, such as the Stuttgart bomb threat(25). It attempts to morally destroy the guerilla and to neutralize the effect of their politics and orientation, to erase the example of revolutionary offensive now, before it has time to establish itself in the minds of people as the hope.

It is sufficient to simply understand where we are: the FRG, the sub-center, the second most powerful imperialist State, where repression is total, where there are apparatus of manipulation and repression, which have never before existed here, even in the times of Nazi Fascism.

And, on the other hand, to combat that, it requires no less than a structure that excludes all of that - because nothing less will do.

It is necessary to indicate what that signifies for each individual at the point in their existence when they begin to struggle, begin to organize in the guerilla: that for all those that do this, this signifies, above all, struggling against all forms of domination, force, and hierarchy.

What is demanded, in the way of will and effort, to undertake the struggle, to organize, and, above all, to assure its continuity, purely and simply rules out all of that bullshit. Or, to put it another way: we couldn't carry out the struggle for liberation, for freedom, if we weren't free, if we were operating within a structure that wasn't free. That is exactly what I learned from the beginning of my involvement in this group, before being arrested in 71 for the first time.

Concretely, in 71 there was a process of collective discussion in illegality, within which the discussion regarding strategy, the determination of the line, was carried out by everyone. It was open. That is, open within the group and open towards the outside. That is to say that there was a very broad discussion with other groups, legal groups as well, or with individuals from legal anti-imperialist organizations. And, of course, the discussion also included the way the activity of the RAF was received. That is to say, how our politics, our actions, were understood and received in these groups. Openness is, in any event, an important element of the structure - and I even want to again add - open to what

others say and being open to every other person.

In any case, what Müller said - that the RAF was an "open group" - has nothing to do with us, with the structure of the organization. It is only a collection of things which reflect well the goal of this entire construction: he wants, in that way, to make the veracity of his information believable and claim that he knows something about the 72 offensive.

It's nonsense. When a group prepares actions, only those who are directly participating know, only those who carry them out. That is clear to a group that struggles illegally. It is completely unnecessary to talk about it. It is, however, necessary to talk about the whole political line - how the relationship between the collective and the individual was understood - not as a contradiction, but both as a goal and as a condition. That is to say that there was the struggle, and it was based on this structure. For example, when one has certain concrete tasks, he develops them himself, he acquires, for himself, the necessary capacities, thinks and pursues his reflections himself - so, if someone takes on a certain task, he does what he must so that it works.

I will, perhaps, say that in yet another way: that which we habitually call discussion - like that unresolvable discussion about strategy, that a certain number of groupuscules carry on, and which has nothing to do with practice, where everyone only gives an abstract point of view and maintains it against others - has no value for us. There is a simple unity: politics and struggle. And the discussion unfolds as it must. Each politic is only possible in that way: as a part of the development of the structure of the group, the totality of the development of the structure of the group, the totality of the organization, and of its analysis. That means that the structure is formed out of each process in the general work process of the group: that is where collectivization unfolds, that is how a revolutionary structure functions, because it is oriented towards a goal and an end, because we do it for that reason and not for any other...

(Prinzing interrupts.)

...and what I've said until now is simply that the goals of the struggles of the guerilla are integrated into the structure of the struggling group - which excludes everything which might be claimed here.

And what results, very clearly, from all of that - from the entire structure, from the collective determination of the goals - is, obviously - and this has already been said here, I believe - that each of us is responsible for the 72 offensive...

(Prinzing interrupts.)

Would you shut your mouth already. This is what I know, what I've

lived...

The strategic definition: against US imperialism, against the military occupation by the USA, was developed in the beginning, that is, when we were still in the phase of construction based on discussion.

We can go back even further, to the student movement, to the protest movement against the Vietnamese War, because it is, quite simply, part of our history, because it was within this experience that the process of politicization developed. And I mean in its totality - the experience itself, on the basis of the unique situation, on the basis of alienation in the metropoles, as well as the experience of the unique possibilities: subjectivity, liberation, and the sense of what the necessary conditions to realize this or, at least, attempt to realize this, were.

It was as a result of the reaction of the system during this period that we acquired, for the first time, a conception of where we were: a conception about this State, of the role and the particular function that it plays in US strategy - how the FRG supported and made possible the intervention of the USA on all levels: military, political, financial, and through propaganda.

What was new, what was strong, what, in general, gave the student movement its power, what mobilized it, was its identification with and orientation towards the liberation struggle of the Vietnamese people, on the basis of which it could identify itself as a part of the global process of the anti-imperialist war of liberation and understand its function as an ally of the people who struggle in the Third World - and as a "second front" in the metropoles. This function of really being a front, identical, they didn't create, but, by their destruction, they clearly exposed the limitations of legal opposition and the possibility to act on that basis. Everyone who perceived this as a point of departure, and didn't want to give it up, was shown that revolutionary politics are only possible here, can only be effective, if armed, illegal and internationalist.

The movement against the Vietnamese War was, as such, - to sum up one more time - the subjective condition on the basis of which the RAF could be and was developed. It was on the basis of this experience and our analyses that we determined the strategic function of the guerilla in the metropole: this was developed as a process internal to the disintegration which was set in motion by the encirclement of the imperialist centers by the liberation struggles in the Third World, on the periphery of the system, who, by their offensive, by their military intervention, were an element of instability. And, as such, the external policy on which they operated was the front.

I've spoken abundantly about this to clearly show the context for the offensive of 72 against the US bases in the FRG; to show that these actions - it is always so - summarize and reveal, by the

goal of the offensive, the entire process, the entire politic...

(Prinzing interrupts.)

Would you stop it, already. You won't succeed in imposing a rhythm or controlling, in any way whatsoever, what I say here.

I want to talk about Andreas again, because there is always an effort here to portray him as a boss or whatever garbage of that sort.

It is, in fact, very simple: if it was as such, how could we have managed to still exist after 6 years(26)? This would really be impossible. But we still exist.

The precise function which Andreas always had - and it is perfectly clear that he assumed leadership, and did so from the beginning - is based on the fact that it was he that made the process, which I've already talked about today, possible. Ulrike once said here, I believe: "he had the most foresight and the greatest power of coordination". That is the essence of it.

And in this process, in which each person wants to struggle - the necessary condition so that the guerilla can, in general, exist: the decision of each person and the will to carry out the struggle - one has a leadership function or he doesn't. But he doesn't claim it. There is no "right to it". It is simply a question of of the clearest overview, which I lived in another way later, after my arrest in 74, in "Info".

I want to say that it was him, amongst all of us, who had the greatest ability to think things through - it is as such that I want to characterize it - to think things through to their end point, to perceive and integrate all of the conditions and the entire process through which our struggle could be developed towards its goal. And I, naturally, oriented myself on the basis of this, because I had the same goal as him - and I repeat: we oriented ourselves on this basis.

That was perfectly clear at the time - I can now say that I had never previously experienced this. It was for me a totally new experience. It is clear that the individual who decides to carry out guerilla struggle must transform all that he has previously experienced, that he must break with what he has experienced and the way in which he has experienced it.

And the campaigns of defamation, which were constantly carried out against him, obviously had a pure and simple propaganda goal, to denounce the guerilla and morally demolish the group. That is to say, a counter-propaganda goal, psychological warfare which operates by personalizing reality, because they cannot attack the contents of revolutionary politics, without, de facto, giving them voice.

But in all of this, there is also, in an entirely precise way, a material goal: he is made into a figure of horror, "naked terror" personified, with the goal of psychologically preparing public opinion, of conditioning public opinion, so as to be able to assassinate him...

(Prinzing interrupts.)

...exactly as it occurred with Ulrike, or, for example, as it was in 72, when she was still outside, with the announcements of her suicide....

(Prinzing interrupts.)

...But the precise essence is that leadership in the guerilla is always leadership against and never leadership "of". It is a function with the goal of rendering itself superfluous as a particular function in the collective group process. That is to say that its goal is to render each person capable of assuming this leadership function...

(Prinzing interrupts.)

I have to repeat: I will speak here as I need to, as we must when we come here for the first time - so that that which we have to say is formulated in the clearest possible way. And if I must think for a moment, I'll take the time. Is that clear?

I want to discuss another complex phenomenon, still related to structure, and I have more things to add related to Andreas. I want to talk about the period following my second arrest, at the beginning of 74.

And this concerns another element here, as well: "Info". As such, all this bullshit thrown at the world regarding the subject of "Info": that it had a hierarchical structure, directives, and orders. And after it was acceptably inflated by the Federal Prosecution via the media, it is now used to construct the accusation of the "establishment of a criminal association within the prison"; that is, all of this nonsense that consists of claiming that the prisoners direct illegal groups on the outside from their cells, etc.. It's such bullshit, given the entire structure - which I've talked about here constantly - it's impossible and absurd on the military plane, and, as a result, on the political plane. In any event - even if it were technically possible - we would refuse to do it.

Good. Now to "Info". "Info" already existed in 74, when I again ended up in prison. As a result of the conditions they were submitted to, the prisoners had created something that went further than anything done by the group I participated in after the first time I came out of prison in 73. "Info" was developed as a result of the necessity, in this situation, of community, of receiving information about what happened in general. It was a surro-

gate for communication.

I could explain it in this way: "Info" was, in essence, the space in which we could live. In isolation, the situation which generally dominates on the outside, and on the basis of which we began armed struggle in illegality, exists in its pure state, in its naked reality. Whoever doesn't create the means of struggle against this situation is destroyed. It is necessary, as such, that one controls the situation and is not controlled by it.

The means developed was "Info". One must clearly understand the conditions: isolation. It's simple. There weren't many issues: either one was destroyed or else one developed something, even in there. And that simply meant always having the will to arrive at the goal. One must, as such, find the way and the means to achieve it, to achieve what one wants, to obtain what one needs, what one aspires to, in isolation, alone - and I learned that when I was in prison the first time, when none of this existed - one develops an enormous desire to simply communicate, and in the only way that that is still possible - with absolute sincerity towards oneself and vis-a-vis others. It's a struggle - it doesn't simply happen...

(Prinzing interrupts.)

One moment, you stupid shit. We understand clearly that for a year your method has been to attempt to axe every coherent intervention.

I was in the process of explaining that it isn't easy. It is not sufficient to simply want it or to wish for it. It is a highly conscious struggle, under the enormous pressure we are submitted to in isolation, to achieve communication between ourselves by writing. And the process which that necessitates, it was Andreas who made it possible, because he kept this process open at every moment. He only intervened when some of the old shit, which was already eliminated, reappeared somewhere. And, obviously, what happens is that, in isolation, we get entangled again in the old structures. It cannot be otherwise when the structures are as complex and as profoundly anchored as they are here in the metropole. I must say that the struggle that we carry out in isolation is the struggle for consciousness: if we don't succeed in establishing new consciousness, then it is the old one which imposes itself.

That is what I mean when I say that it was Andreas, in prison as was the case on the outside, who gave the collective process its orientation, that his methods of struggle represent for each of us a means to orient ourselves - that I could discover, in the way in which he did something when he understood what was going on, something which I previously didn't know.

And one of the ways that we attempted to assume, in a given phase

of the process of collectivization, in "Info", was the method of criticism and self-criticism. As such, to radically examine oneself, really know everything about oneself, and to know the same things about each of the others that one demands to know about oneself. That means that the exchange, the interaction, resides in the transmission of individual process, in an understanding of the point one is at, of the point from where one must struggle - and in isolation, each of us experienced this again in an entirely different existential dimension: that struggle, that identity, is only possible collectively.

One, naturally, cannot separate that from all of the other things on which we worked. For example, the texts and analyses about the structure of capital, about military strategy, or about counter-insurgency, analyses that were developed in the process of collective discussions.

We never said to anyone, you have to do this or that, but we said what there was to do, what each person could do, if he wanted to. That is the condition - the will. Constraint and submission, or competitive struggles for imaginary positions in an imaginary hierarchy, signify, in isolation, under these conditions, quite simply, that the group is on the point of exploding, that it won't survive much longer - that it can no longer struggle.

Only an idiot could believe all the rubbish developed here as counter-propaganda against us.

July-August 1976

Footnotes

- (1) Gerhard Müller - supporter of the RAF who turned State evidence after his arrest.
- (2) Brigitte Mohnhaupt - founding member of the RAF arrested in the early 70s. She was released and went back underground. Arrested again in 1984, she is now serving a life sentence. Stammheim - high security prison in Stuttgart. A special court, used for trials of RAF members, was constructed inside the complex.
- (3) Theodor Prinzing - judge in the first major RAF trial.
- (4) Ulrike Meinhof - founding member of the RAF, murdered in prison in 1976.
- (5) Federal Republic of Germany - FRG, West Germany
- (6) On May 11, 1972, a RAF bomb destroyed the Officer's Club of the US Army in Frankfurt. A Colonel was killed and 13 Officers were injured. On May, 25, 1972, a RAF bomb exploded at the Headquarters of the American Army in Heidelberg. A Captain and 2 Sergeants were killed, 5 others were injured. The kidnappings were never carried out.
- (7) Stern - weekly bourgeois news journal.

- (8) Andreas Baader - founding member of the RAF, murdered in prison in October 1977.
- (9) Gudrun Ensslin - founding member of the RAF, murdered in prison in October 1977.
- (10) On May 12, 1972, the RAF bombed the Bavarian Police Headquarters in Munich in retaliation for the police shooting of RAF member, Tommy Weissbecker, in Ausburg.
- (11) The five were Ulrike Meinhof, Gudrun Ensslin, Jan-Carl Raspe, Holger Meins, and Andreas Baader. Ulrike Meinhof was murdered in prison 1976. Holger Meins died on hunger-strike in 1974.
- (12) See note number 10.
- (13) Petra Schelm - On July 15, 1972, Petra Schelm, a RAF member, was shot dead by police at a roadblock in Hamburg. Thomas Weissbecker - see note number 10.
- (14) Springer Bombing - On May 19. 1972, the RAF bombed the Springer building. Three telephone warnings were ignored and 17 people were injured.
- (15) The State and media apparati claimed Ulrike Meinhof committed suicide as a result of tensions within the group in prison. This propaganda contradicts all independent studies which indicate that she was murdered. See Jan-Carl Raspe's statement on this subject elsewhere in this book.
- (16) Siegfried Hausner - On April 24, 1975, the Commando Holger of the RAF took over the West German Embassy in Stockholm, Sweden. They demanded the release of 26 political prisoners held in West Germany. Police stormed the building, setting off explosives laid by the commando, and injuring Siegfried Hausner. He was denied necessary medical attention and subsequently died in transit.
- (17) Commando Holger Meins - see note number 16.
- (18) Info - a magazine of writings by political prisoners, that allowed the prisoners to stay in touch with each other's ideas.
- (19) Holger Meins - see note number 11.
- (20) Movement 2nd of June - Anarchist guerilla movement based in West Berlin. It dissolved in 1977, and a part of the membership entered the RAF.
- (21) Astrid Proll - founding member of the RAF. She had to be released from prison after the dead wing destroyed her health. She fled and rearrested years later in England, after which she served a short sentence. She has disavowed her RAF politics and now actively works for amnesty for prisoners who have left the RAF in prison.
- (22) Helmut Pohl - early RAF member and political prisoner.
- (23) Reference to 2 prison guards.
- (24) Klaus Jünschke - a RAF prisoner. He attacked the judge, Theodor Prinzing, on the day before Helmut Pohl's testimony.
- (25) False communiqües were issued in the name of the RAF. They alleged a campaign of random bombings for June 2, 1972. These communiqües had their source in the Security police counter-insurgency campaign.
- (26) The RAF was founded in 1970. Baader was arrested in 1972, with Raspe, and Meins.